

Krista M. Enns (CA 206430)  
Benesch, Friedlander, Coplan & Aronoff LLP  
100 Pine Street, Suite 3100  
San Francisco, California 94111  
Telephone: 628.600.2250  
Facsimile: 628.221.5828  
kenns@beneschlaw.com

Attorneys for Defendants SmileDirectClub, LLC, SDC Financial LLC, SmileDirectClub, Inc., David Katzman, Steven Katzman, Jeffrey Sulitzer, Sulitzer Professional Corporation, Alex Fenkell, Jordan Katzman, and Camelot Venture Group

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

## ALIGN TECHNOLOGY, INC.,

Plaintiff,

V.

SMILEDIRECTCLUB, LLC; SDC FINANCIAL LLC; SMILEDIRECTCLUB, INC; DAVID KATZMAN; STEVEN KATZMAN; JEFFREY SULITZER; SULITZER PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION; ALEX FENKELL; JORDAN KATZMAN; CAMELOT VENTURE GROUP,

## Defendants.

Case No. 3:23-cv-00023-EMC

**DEFENDANTS' ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION TO REDACT AND SEAL  
LIMITED PORTION OF TRANSCRIPT**

1 Pursuant to General Order No. 59 and Civil Local Rules 7-11 and 79-5, Defendants  
 2 SmileDirectClub, LLC, SDC Financial LLC, SmileDirectClub, Inc., David Katzman, Steven Katzman,  
 3 Jeffrey Sulitzer, Sulitzer Professional Corporation, Alex Fenkell, Jordan Katzman, and Camelot Venture  
 4 Group (collectively, “Defendants”) request an order directing the clerk to redact and seal a limited portion  
 5 of the transcript (Dkt. 97, the “Transcript”) of the hearing (the “Hearing”) held on May 4, 2023.

6 During the Hearing, there was a single reference to information the Court has previously held  
 7 should be sealed. The Court should keep the seal in place by ordering that this narrow portion of the  
 8 Transcript be redacted.

9 **I. BACKGROUND**

10 On January 3, 2023, Plaintiff Align Technology, Inc. (“Align”) filed a Complaint against  
 11 Defendants. (Dkt. 1.) Within certain paragraphs of the Complaint, Align quoted or paraphrased parts of  
 12 a confidential arbitration award, which Align also attached as an exhibit to the Complaint. (See *id.* ¶¶ 9,  
 13 95-103, 170-173.) Align also filed a motion to seal these paragraphs of the Complaint, in addition to the  
 14 arbitration award itself. (Dkt. 2.) Defendants later filed their own motion to seal this material as well.  
 15 (Dkt. 26.) And the parties fully briefed the issue. (See Dkts. 2, 11, 16, 17, 26, 27, 33, 35.) In their  
 16 substantive briefs and declarations, Defendants explained (i) the legitimate private or public interests that  
 17 warrant sealing; (ii) the injury that will result if sealing is denied; and (iii) why a less restrictive alternative  
 18 to sealing is not sufficient. (See Dkts. 26, 33.)

19 On February 9, 2023, the Court entered an order granting in part and denying in part the parties’  
 20 motions to seal. (Dkt. 36.) As relevant here, after finding that the “compelling reasons” standard applies  
 21 to a request to seal any portion of a complaint, the Court granted Defendants’ request to seal the last  
 22 sentence of paragraph 98 of the Complaint, “which provides some specific numbers.” (*Id.* at 3:23–24.)

23 On May 4, 2023, the Court held oral argument on Defendants’ motions to dismiss Align’s  
 24 Complaint. (Dkt. 86.) During the Hearing, there was a single reference to one of the specific numbers in  
 25 paragraph 98 of the Complaint that the Court had previously determined should be kept under seal. (See  
 26 Dkt. 97 at 18:7-9.)

1 **II. ARGUMENT**

2 When a party references material that has "no bearing on the resolution of the dispute on the  
 3 merits," courts review requests to seal for good cause. *Network Appliance, Inc. v. Sun Microsystems Inc.*,  
 4 No. C-07-06053 EDL, 2010 WL 841274, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 10, 2010). The good-cause standard  
 5 applies even if that material is cited in the context of a dispositive motion. See *id.* at \*2.

6 Here, the limited portion of the Transcript that Defendants seek to seal has no bearing on the  
 7 resolution of the dispute on the merits. Thus, under the exception stated in *Network Appliance*, the "good  
 8 cause" standard applies. Should the Court disagree, and instead apply the "compelling reasons" standard,  
 9 however, the result is the same.

10 In its prior sealing order, the Court ordered that the specific numbers in paragraph 98 of the  
 11 Complaint be sealed. (Dkt. 36 at 3:23–24.) Reference to one of those numbers was made during the  
 12 Hearing. (See Dkt. 97 at 18:8.) For the same reasons stated in the Court's previous order, the Court should  
 13 order that this limited portion of the Hearing Transcript be redacted and sealed. The same compelling  
 14 reasons that justified the sealing of the specific numbers referenced within the Complaint justify the  
 15 sealing of that same information within the Hearing Transcript. Rather than disturb its prior ruling, the  
 16 Court should keep the seal in place, no matter where the information is repeated. Consequently, the  
 17 specific number that appears on page 18, line 8 of the Transcript should be ordered redacted and sealed.

18 **III. CONCLUSION**

19 For the foregoing reasons, Defendants respectfully request that the Court redact and seal the  
 20 number identified at page 18, line 8 of the Transcript (Dkt. 97 at 18:8).

21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28

1 Dated: June 8, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

3 *s/ Krista M. Enns*  
KRISTA M. ENNS (CA 206430)

4 Benesch, Friedlander, Coplan & Aronoff LLP  
5 100 Pine Street, Suite 3100  
6 San Francisco, California 94111  
7 Telephone: 628.600.2250  
Facsimile: 628.221.5828  
Email: kenns@beneschlaw.com

8 Attorneys for Defendants SmileDirectClub, LLC,  
9 SDC Financial LLC, SmileDirectClub, Inc.,  
10 David Katzman, Steven Katzman, Jeffrey  
11 Sulitzer, Sulitzer Professional Corporation, Alex  
Fenkell, Jordan Katzman, and Camelot Venture  
Group